



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/761,524

01/21/2004

Robert Wham

2155 CIP CON

4222

50855

7590

05/30/2006

UNITED STATES SURGICAL,
A DIVISION OF TYCO HEALTHCARE GROUP LP
195 MCDERMOTT ROAD
NORTH HAVEN, CT 06473

EXAMINER

PEFFLEY, MICHAEL F

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3739

DATE MAILED: 05/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/761,524

Applicant(s)

WHAM ET AL.

Examiner

Michael Peffley

Art Unit

3739

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 and 28-60 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 28-60 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 January 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/21/04
10/24/05
4/27/06

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of the invention of Group I, claims 1-18 in the reply filed on May 9, 2006 is acknowledged. It is noted that claims 19-27 have been canceled and claims 28-60 are withdrawn.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the "Cross Reference to Related Applications" section should be updated to provide the most current status (i.e. US Patent Number) of the related applications. Also, the Brief Description of the Drawings section needs to be amended to provide a brief description for Figures 7A and 7B. Currently there is only a description for Figure 7, which figure does not exist.

Appropriate correction is required.

Drawings

New corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in this application because the originally filed drawings are deemed informal (particularly Figure 16). Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsman outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. The corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-13 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Miller, III (5,836,943).

Miller discloses an electrosurgical system and method of treating tissue that comprises a controller for controlling the output pulses of the generator in response to measured tissue characteristics. In particular, Miller specifically teaches that impedance and/or rate of change of impedance is used to control the output of the generator in a method for treating tissue (col. 6, lines 13-61). As disclosed at column 12, lines 64 through column 13, line 10, tissue impedance is measured between pulses, and the generator is then regulated to control subsequent output pulses of the generator. Output pulses are controlled by varying the duty cycle and the magnitude of the output voltage (col. 10, lines 11-20).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller, III ('943) in view of the teaching of Yates et al (5,558,671).

As addressed above, Miller discloses a system and method for controlling output pulses of a generator for coagulating (i.e. sealing) tissue by monitoring tissue impedance after a pulse (i.e. between pulses) and using the measured impedance to control subsequent pulses. Miller does not disclose the use of a look-up table as the means to arrive at the values for the subsequent pulses.

Yates et al disclose another tissue sealing device that relies on impedance feedback to control the output of an RF generator. In particular, Yates et al disclose various algorithms for controlling future application of energy based on the sensed impedance including using a look-up table to determine future energy applications (col. 8, lines 8-22).

To have provided the Miller, III system with a look-up table as a means to determine output levels for a generator in response to sensed tissue impedance would have been an obvious consideration for one of ordinary skill in the art in view of the teaching of Yates et al.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir.

Art Unit: 3739

1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-18 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 23-52 of U.S. Patent No. 6,398,779.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the step of "keeping constant or varying RF energy parameters" in the instant claims is deemed to be substantially analogous and obvious with respect to the step of simply "varying RF energy parameters" as set forth in the patented claims.

Claims 1-18 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the pending claims of copending Application No. 10/919,613. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they recite the same basic method steps with minimal differences.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 1-18 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the pending claims of

copending Application No. 10/626,390. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they recite the same basic method steps with minimal differences.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Peffley whose telephone number is (571) 272-4770. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 6am-3pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Linda Dvorak can be reached on (571) 272-4764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Michael Peffley

Application/Control Number: 10/761,524
Art Unit: 3739

Page 7

Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3739

mp
May 22, 2006